INDEX

Page

Appropriations for Army engineers:
- Ceiling on request normally set by Bureau of the Budget ... 98
- Overceiling list submitted prior to fiscal year 1956 budget request ... 98
- Overceiling list not permitted for fiscal year 1957 ... 98
- Percentage expended in Pacific Northwest ... 109

Asotin Dam ... 325, 326
- Added downstream benefits from Hells Canyon Dam at ... 276

Arrow Lakes project at Castlegar: 9
- Cost at downstream plants of power benefits from ... 139
- Ebasco Services, Inc., preliminary report on ... 354
- Flood control benefits from ... 52
- Kaiser Aluminum Co., proposal for ... 54, 171–173
- Natural regulation at ... 356
- Outflow of, correlated to Castelgar elevation ... 300
- Power benefits from ... 46, 51, 138–139, 359
- Storage capacity of, correlated to Castlegar elevation ... 361

Atkins project ... 338
Barnaby, J. T., United States Fish and Wildlife Service ... 315
Boundary Dam ... 238, 241
Brown, F. S., Corps of Engineers ... 300, 320
Bruces Eddy Dam:
- Army engineers' recommendations on ... 188–192
- Cost of power from ... 51
- Opposition by wildlife groups to ... 146, 176–182
- Partnership proposal for ... 188, 190
- Prime power added to system ... 49–51
- Statistical summary of ... 191

Buchanan, Thomas C., Chairman, Federal Power Commission: Letter to Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association ... 254
Buffalo Rapids No. 4 project ... 249–250, 331
- Conflict with Paradise Dam ... 205, 249–250

Canadian proposal for separate study of problems regarding the use of waterpower on rivers crossing the international boundary ... 197–198, 200, 348–350, 351

Canadian storage in Columbia Basin:
- Columbia River power system, effect on ... 78, 81–82
- Current studies of ... 301
- Decreasing value of ... 53, 81, 102
- Potential storage available ... 9, 248

Capital budgeting ... 285
Clarke Fork River Basin:
- Additional tributary storage possibilities in ... 292–293
- Average storable flow of ... 289, 295
- Bureau of Reclamation report on ... 286
- Cost of storage at sites in ... 290–292
- General description of ... 287
- Glacier View second most desirable site in ... 290
- Nine Mile Prairie, third most desirable site in ... 291
- Paradise Dam best storage site in ... 286, 290
- Potential storage sites in ... 289–293
- Projects under study in Columbia River review report ... 329
- Sites eliminated from consideration in ... 293–295, 329
- Storage objectives for ... 288, 300

Page
Clarkston Dam 326–327
Added downstream benefits from Hells Canyon Dam at 276
Colby, L. A., Montana representative on General Advisory Committee 320
Columbia River Basin:
Canadian storage potential in 248
Clark Fork River Basin as a component of 287
Compatibility of storage development for flood control, storage, etc., in 153, 314
Conflicting interests at storage sites in 146, 288
Cost of money, effect on ultimate development of 161, 283
Decreasing possibilities for storage in 246
Fish problems in 116–118, 135–137
Flood control storage, present outlook for 79, 91, 300
Geography of 8, 44
How Big Is the Columbia River?—Article by Gus Norwood 296–298
Hydroelectric power potential of 248
Irrigation potential in United States portion of 162
Possible Canadian projects in 9–10
Potential storage projects in United States portion of 209, 237, 239, 248, 300
Separate negotiations to settle international problems relating to 7, 106, 197
Storage presently available in 90
Unutilized flow at main-stem projects in 61
Columbia River Basin storage:
Canadian potential for 248
Compatability of flood control and power purposes of 153, 314
Conflicting interests at sites for 146, 288
Decreasing availability of 246
Effect on power potential of lack of 239
Flood control relationship to 233, 237, 239, 244, 248, 309
Presently available 74, 90
Present outlook for 79, 91, 300, 318–319
Proposed and existing for flood control 79, 90, 232, 300
Provided by main control plan 74, 79, 80, 237, 248, 288, 300
Relationship to firm power capability 245
Required for regulated discharge 243, 248
United States potential 209, 237, 239, 248, 300
Columbia River Development Corporation:
Four tests for a regional power agency 279–286
History of proposal 277–278
Columbia River diversion in Canada:
Adverse effect on addition to Columbia River power system 163
Amount of, proposed 99
Canadian studies of 6, 13–14
Chronology of 175
Danger to fisheries of 20
Description of 210
Effect on power projects in United States 99, 100
Effect on irrigation projects in United States 162
Funds appropriated for study of 206
Importance to United States 7
Langlie, Hon. Arthur B., Governor of Washington, report of views of 348
Columbia River floods:
Canadian storage, effect on 76
Contributions of specific tributaries of floods of 1894 and 1948 ..... 119–120, 314
Control of, by storage 74, 79, 90, 232, 237, 244, 248, 300
Damage from floods in Columbia River Basin 75, 93–94
Dependence of flood control on power generation 76
Effect of present status of main control plan projects on control of 300
Effect of various quantities of storage on 1894 flood 233, 309
Hydrograph of 1894 flood regulated by main control plan 307
Hydrograph of 1894 flood regulated by sequence IV of proposed Columbia River Review report 308
International nature of flood-control problem 233–234
Levees, use of to control 105
Major floods of record 73, 232

Columbia River floods—Continued Page
Need for definite flood-control goal 232
Need for large upstream storage to control 239
Power system operation compatible with control of 153, 314
Present outlook for control of 105
Relationship of storage capacity to 244
Similkameen River contributions to 233
Snake River Basin contributions to 119
Snowpack in Columbia Basin:
Comparison of April 1, 1948, and March 1, 1956 89
1956 comparable to 1894 90
Storage, effect of remoteness from flood areas 92
Storage needed for control of 237, 244, 248
Storage proposed and existing for control of 74, 79, 90, 232, 300
Columbia River flows:
At Castlegar, monthly, 1928–53 362
At Mica Creek, monthly, 1928–50 363
At various points on the river 247
Contributions by separate tributaries to 168, 247
Maximum and minimum recorded 248
Maximum, median, and minimum years 242
Relationship of storage to maximum 244
Storage required for regulated discharge 243, 248
Unutilized at main-stem projects 61
Columbia River navigation:
Barge traffic in 310
Channel velocity, effects on 311
Effect of peaking operations on 302
Effect of completion of the Dalles Dam on 302
Increased benefits based on reappraisal of 309
Peaking operations not controlling on 310–311
Snake River channel velocity effects on 311
Columbia River power system:
Average annual capability of 297
Canadian storage, effect on 78, 81–82
Compatibility of flood control and power in operation of 153, 314
Cost of money, effect on extent of development of 161, 283
Cost of power generation by future resources in 151, 157
Demand for electricity, future estimates of 280
Economic effect of lack of upstream storage in 239
Effect of lack of storage on degree of development of 239
Estimated future growth and energy resources for 150
Extent of development, effect of cost of money on 161, 283
Future additions to, cost of power from 157
Ground rules for system analysis in Columbia River review report 304–306
Hydroelectric characteristics of 8
Importance of upstream storage to 231–232
Incremental power costs from upstream projects 51
Investment needs, future estimates of 280
Main control plan, installed capacity of 80
Northwest power pool, generating capacity of members of 214
Percentage of potential in Snake River Basin 251
Permissible installed capacity at various load factors of 297
Potential of 20 percent developed 110
Power duration curve, C level and Canadian projects 152
Prime power increments from upstream projects 48–49
Projects included in future cost of power estimates 157
Relationship of storage to firm capability of 245
River flows unutilized at main-stem projects 61
Thermal power, addition to 77, 112–113, 147, 300, 304–305
Three dimensions of 296
Undeveloped power potential of 245
Value of peaking power in 297
Columbia River reference:
History of 36
Text of 43

Page

Columbia River review report:
Consulting board on power studies of 312–313
General goals of 299
Ground rules for system analysis in 304–305
Projects to be considered in 305–306
Schedule of report studies 303
Senate committee resolution requesting 302–304
Columbia River review report, General Advisory Committee:
General goals of report 299
Meeting September 20, 1955, conference notes 299–312
Meeting January 17, 1950, conference notes 312–319
Meeting March 20, 1956, conference notes 319–341
Rules of procedure 299
Cost allocations:
Incremental method used by Bonneville Power Administration 159
Interagency study method 158
System allocation method used by Corps of Engineers 106, 111
Cost of money, effect on potential river development 161, 283
Curlew project 340
Demuth, Orren E., Bonneville Power Administration 301
Dexter, Grant, article by, entitled "Attack on Canadian Power" 372–375
Downstream benefits from upstream storage:
Canadian position on need for study 12
Canadian benefits from United States storage 41
Federal Power Commission's ideas concerning 122, 131
Negotiating value of, Canadian position 12, 17–18
United States benefits from Canadian storage 140
United States position with respect to 19, 107
United States unwillingness to discuss payment for, Canadian view 13
Value of upstream storage factors controlling 17–18, 247
Ebasco Service, Inc., preliminary report on effect of Mica Creek and Arrow Lakes storage on Columbia River power supply in the United States 354–363
Comments by Jack D. Stevens on 370–371
Electric load growth, Pacific Northwest:
Bonneville Power Administration, estimates of 141, 313
Factors involved in 301
Federal Power Commission, estimates of 77, 313, 315–317
General Electric Co., estimates of 313
Historical and estimated future, by consumer classes 141
Long-range outlook for 150
Monthly requirements in 1979–80, Federal Power Commission estimates of 317
Procedure for estimating in Columbia River review report 301
Special interagency study estimates of 46
Grand Coulee Dam modification project 337
Hatt, Ellis L., Soil Conservation Service 302
Heat pump 281
Hells Canyon Dam:
Added downstream benefits 276
Alternative financing possibility 276–278
Army engineers recommendations on 192–194
At-site and downstream benefits of 234, 275, 276
Downstream power benefits of 234, 275, 276
Fact sheet of 278
Hells Canyon principle 278
History of, 1947–52 253, 254
Present status in 308 report review 300
Relative power development and costs 278
Storage loss at, effect of 90, 91, 300
House Document 531—308 report:
Current review, resolution requesting 53
Current review, status of 53, 73, 75, 90, 299–341
Flood control storage of 79, 233, 237
Flood damage, effect of main control plan on 93–94
History of 72

House Document 531—308 report—Continued Page
Main control plan 74, 79, 80, 237, 248, 288, 300
Power and storage provided by phases of 237
Project data, phase C–2 system 241
Review report, General Advisory Committee. (*See* Columbia River review report, General Advisory Committee.)
Enaville project 333–334
Energy use growth, future estimates 280–281
Ferguson, G. W., editor, Montreal Star, article in Washington Post and Times Herald entitled, "Maybe United States Isn't 'on Toast'—St. Laurent Gives Canada a Jolt" 349–350
Fernald, Gordon H., Corps of Engineers 301, 314, 315, 320
Financial feasibility of hydroelectric projects:
Assumed service life, effect on 296
Effect of cost of money on 161, 283
Fisheries resources:
Benefits of upstream storage to 135
Clearwater River 116–117
Columbia River 135
Endangered by Columbia River Canadian diversion 20, 137
Fraser River 137
Present conflict of Nez Perce proposal with 208
Salmon River 116–117, 208
Flathead Lake outlet channel improvements 332
Foote, L. H., Brig. Gen., Corps of Engineers 299, 312, 319, 320
Fraser River Diversion. (*See* Columbia River Diversion.)
Garden Valley Dam 322–324
Glacier View Dam:
Alternative storage possibilities available 295–296
Cost per acre-foot of storage same as Paradise 290
Interior Department opposition to 238, 286, 290
No further studies contemplated by Bureau of Reclamation 301
Present status in 308 Report review 300
Reasons for opposition to 290–291
Reconsideration recommended by Bureau of Reclamation 296
Second most desirable site in Clark Fork Basin 290
Statistics 241
Usable storage capacity of 288, 290
Hungry Horse Dam:
At-site and downstream power benefits of 234, 274
Benefits of coordinated operation with system 153, 247
Depreciation period of 150 years used for 296–297
Double-duty operation of 231
Downstream power benefits of 274
Interest component of power cost 278, 282
Operating statement for first year 278
Use as "Yardstick" for flood control 232, 233, 248
Humphrey, Tom, editor, Portland, Oreg. Journal, article entitled "Libby Dam Shelved by Canadian Demands" 347–348
Hutchison, Bruce, article in Christian Science Monitor entitled "United States, Canada, Move on Thorny Issues" 350–352
Inglis, Peter, articles in Vancouver Province (British Columbia) entitled "Columbia River Crisis" 341–346
Interagency Committee on Water Resources 199
International Columbia River Engineering Committee—An agency of the International Joint Commission 72
Joint Studies currently in progress 106, 313
International Joint Commission:
Appointment of United States members of 7
International Columbia River Engineering Board an agency of 72
Policy formulation, procedure for 103
Recommendations by Senator Neuberger concerning 23
Relationship to State Department 64–66
Responsibility for negotiations with Canada 21
Treaty of 1909 establishing 25–31
United States position in 19

Page
International nature of flood-control problem 233–234
John Day Dam:
Present status in 308 report review 300
Storage proposed for 90
Johnson, Oliver, Corps of Engineers 314
Jordan, Gov. Len, Chairman, United States Section, International Joint Commission:
Excerpts from speech before Pacific Northwest Trade Association, Portland, Oreg., Apr. 12, 1954 39–40
Previous opposition to Federal Columbia River program, Senator Neuberger's views on 21–23
Remarks before Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Salem, Oreg., Nov. 15, 1955 216–223
Report on speech before Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, Missoula, Mont., May 27, 1955 347–348
Statement at meeting of International Joint Commission, Ottawa, Canada, Oct. 4–7, 1955 56–60
Testimony of 32–62, 201–230
Kaiser Aluminum Co., proposal for Arrow Lakes project 54, 171–173
Kooskia Dam 238, 239, 241
Kootenai River diversion in Canada:
Canadian studies of 13, 14, 301, 313
Chronology of 175
Effect on Libby Dam 99
Kulp, Mark T., Idaho Commissioner of Reclamation 320
Langlie, Hon. Arthur B., Governor of Washington, reported views on Columbia River Canadian diversion 348
Lesage, Hon. Jean, Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources of Canada, address before Pacific Northwest Trade Association, Vancouver, British Columbia, May 9, 1955 375–380
Lewis, David J., Corps of Engineers 313, 320
Libby Dam project:
Chronology of 175
Cost at downstream dams of power benefits from 139
Description of 334–335
Historical development of 34, 63, 175
Impasse on, Canadian view 12
Narrative report on 334–335
No basis to consider as a project in reasonable prospect 320
Power production of 46–51
Present status in 308 review report 300, 320
Proposal to deauthorize 67–69
Sequence of development desirable 80, 99
Statistics on 241
Study by International Columbia River Engineering Board 72
Little Bitteroot River 338
Lola Creek project 337
Long Meadows project 335–336
Main control plan:
Flood control storage provided by 79
Hydrograph of 1894 flood regulated by 307
Installed capacity provided by 80
Present status of 74, 79, 90–91, 300
Storage projects in 237
Marks, Callison, articles in Spokane Spokesman-Review entitled "Columbia Comment—Dicks Canadian Diversion" and "Columbia Comment—New River Studies Awaited" 227–229
Marsing Dam 321–322
McNaughton, Gen. A. G. L., Chairman, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission 11, 12
Excerpt from statement before Standing Committee External Affairs, House of Commons, March 9, 1955 38–39
Summary and excerpts of testimony before Parliamentary Committee on External Affairs 12–15

Page
Meadow Creek project 341
Mica Creek Dam project:
Chiefly beneficial for hydroelectric power 81
Cost of downstream plants of power benefits from 139, 142
Downstream benefits from 174, 359
Ebasco Services, Inc., preliminary report on 354
Flood-control benefits from 52
Independent operation of 357
Location of 9
Operation for Northwest Powel Pool 357
Power production of 46–51
Puget Sound Utilities Council proposal for 55, 173–174
Sequence of development desirable 80, 99
Storage at 9, 174
Murie, Dr. Olaus J., president, Wilderness Society, statement of 195–196
Nelson, Harold T., Bureau of Reclamation 301
Nelson, Mark L., Corps of Engineers 300, 302
Paper on ground rules for system analysis 304
Nez Perce Dam 208, 241
Added downstream benefits from Hells Canyon Dam at 276
Nighthawk project 233, 337
Ninemile project 330–331
Northwest Public Power Association, Inc.:
Resolution on Columbia River Canadian diversion 354
Testimony of 231–298
Norwood, Gus, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association 320
Letter to chairman 231–298
Ovando project 338
Paradise Dam:
Alternative site at Eddy 238
Best storage site in Clark Fork Basin 286, 295
Comparison with combination of other sites 291–292
Cost per acre-foot of storage at 290
Interference of proposed Montana Power Co. Buffalo Rapids dams with 205, 249–250
Loss of storage at alternatives to 93, 291
No further studies contemplated by Bureau of Reclamation 301
No substitute available for large-scale storage development of 295
Reasons for opposition to 290
Reconsideration recommended by Bureau of Reclamation 296
Statistics of 241
Usable storage capacity of 290
Penny Cliffs Dam:
Army engineers' recommendations on 188–192
Opposition of wildlife groups to 146, 176–181
Partnership proposal for 188, 190
Prime power added to system 49–51
Statistical summary of 191
Power shortage dangers in Northwest 173
Priest Rapids Dam:
Present status in 308 report review 300
Storage proposed for 91
Puget Sound Utilities Council:
Membership of 174
Mica Creek, proposal of 55, 173, 174
Raver, D. Paul, superintendent, Seattle City Light 54–55, 176
Rays Ferry Dam 324–325
Rees, I. J., Federal Power Commission 320
Regional Power Agency, four tests for: 279
Abundant power 279
Comprehensive development 283
Consumer orientation 284
Low-cost power 281
Richards, Leverett: Article entitled "River Studies Show Possibility of Flood Worse Than 1948 Disaster" in Oregonian, March 15, 1956 85–86
Senior, C. Norman, Canadian Consul General in Seattle, Wash 176

Page

Similkameen River Dam 233
Nighthawk project, substitute for 337
Snake River Basin:
Annual flow of 168
Channel velocity, effects on navigation 311
Comparison with Columbia River 251
Contribution to floods of 1894 and 1948 119–120
Importance to navigation 310
Potential damsites in 252, 321–328
Power potential of 250, 252
Projects deferred from consideration in Columbia River review report 328
Storage in 210
Special Interagency Study, United States and Canadian storage projects:
Assumptions questioned 19–20
Statement by Jack P. Stevens regarding 366–369
Text of summary report on 43–53
Springston Dam 238
Spruce Park project 332–333
Stevens, Jack D., consulting engineer, Puget Sound Utilities Council:
Comments on preliminary report of Ebasco Services, Inc 370–371
Letter to Senator James E. Murray 364–365
Statement regarding special interagency study 366–369
Stillwater River project 339–340
St. Laurent, Rt. Hon. L. S., Prime Minister of Canada 197–198, 349–351
St. Joe River project 340
Storage, loss of in current review of 308 report 79, 233, 300
Glacier View Dam 91
Hells Canyon Dam 90, 91
John Day Dam 90
Paradise Dam 93
Priest Rapids Dam 91
Swan River project 338–339
Thomson River project 329
Torpen, Ben E 231
Paper delivered before CBIAC, January 12, 1951 235
Undeveloped waterpower in river basins draining into Pacific Ocean between California and Canada 256–273
Von Guten, Glenn H., Corps of Engineers 302
Paper on river regulation studies 310–312
Walker, John D., Corps of Engineers 302
Paper on navigation 309
Walker, J. R., article in Vancouver (British Columbia) Province, entitled "Canada Seeks Power Parley" 348–349
Wenatchee River Basin development 336
Wing, Lesher S., Federal Power Commission 313
Woods, Wilfred R., editor, Wenatchee Daily World, article 352–353

○